

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully **traverses** the rejection of claims 2-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable (obvious) over Nystrom '334 in view of Ono (JP '063).

First, Applicant wishes to thank Examiner McCarry for the telephone interview so courteously granted to the undersigned attorney on December 11, 2006.

During the interview, the attorney pointed out to the Examiner that the Examiner, under his "Response to Arguments", did not address Applicant's arguments directed to the limitation "cantilever fashion" in claim 8. No agreement was reached, but Examiner McCarry suggested that Applicant file a Request for Reconsideration further explaining why Nystrom does not meet/describe/suggest the "cantilever fashion" limitation of claim 8.

Thus, Applicant incorporates by reference Applicant's still valid arguments presented in the Amendment filed on February 24, 2006 and which also apply to the present rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), and respectfully asks Examiner Zimmerman carefully to consider the following **additional** arguments which are directed to the comments made by the Examiner during the telephone interview of December 11.

Applicant attaches a "first" drawing based on Nystrom where arrows A1 and A2 have been added to show the forces exerted by the electrodes on each side of the overlapping zone of sheets 11 and 12. Since this overlapping zone is biased on each side, the first and second sheets cannot be viewed as being cantilevered in the overlapping zone.

Applicant also attaches "second" and "third" drawings based on Figs. 5 and 8 of the present application, where it is necessary to bias only one side. Therefore, the second arrow A2

AMENDMENT AND REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION...
U.S. APPLN. NO. 09/462,206

has been crossed out, and there is no backing support facing the first arrow A1 so that, in that region, the sheets 5 (Fig. 5) or 88 (Fig. 8) are cantilevered (i.e., not supported in the center of the "zone of overlap").

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to enter the above amendments because they merely clarify the language to more closely explicitly match Applicant's arguments already of record, and because it will not require any further search and/or consideration by Examiner McCarry. These proposed amendments were not earlier made because they were not considered necessary or even desirable until the above-noted telephone interview with Examiner McCarry on December 11.

REQUEST FOR INTERVIEW

If, for any reason, Examiner McCarry feels that the application still is not in condition for allowance with claims 2-8, he is respectfully requested to **call the undersigned attorney** to discuss any unresolved issues and to expedite the disposition of the application.

Applicant files concurrently herewith a Petition (with fee) for an Extension of Time of one month. Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this application, and any required fee for such extension is to be

AMENDMENT AND REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION...
U.S. APPLN. NO. 09/462,206

charged to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. The Commissioner is also authorized to charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and/or § 1.17 necessary to keep this application pending in the Patent and Trademark Office or credit any overpayment to said Deposit Account No. 19-4880.

Respectfully submitted,

/John H. Mion/
John H. Mion
Registration No. 18,879

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20037-3213
(202) 663-7901

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: December 27, 2006